

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

STACY LYNN SANDERS,)	
PLAINTIFF,)	
VS.)	2:15-cv-1029-JHH
DR. JAMIE CANNON, et al.,)	
DEFENDANTS.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION


The court has before it two motions to dismiss. The first is the June 18, 2015 Motion (Doc. #3) to Dismiss filed by Defendant Dr. Jamie Cannon. On June 23, 2015, the court entered an order explaining why the Motion (Doc. #3) to Dismiss was due to be granted, and gave Plaintiff until July 28, 2015 to show cause why it should not. (See Doc. # 6.)

The second motion was filed on June 23, 2015 Motion (Doc. #7) to Dismiss filed by the Board of Trustees of the University of Alabama (incorrectly named in the complaint as the University of Alabama in Birmingham and as University of Alabama Hospital). On June 25, 2015, the court entered an order explaining why this Motion (Doc. #7) was due to be granted, and again gave Plaintiff until July 28, 2015 to show cause why it should not. (See Doc. # 8.)

On July 27, 2015, Plaintiff filed an Answer (Doc. #9) to the Show Cause order, addressing both Motions to Dismiss.¹ After a thorough examination of the arguments contained in Plaintiff's Answer, the court is unpersuaded in its original analysis that the Motions to Dismiss are due to be granted. Therefore, for the reasons stated in the court's June 23, 2015 and June 25, 2015 orders (Docs. # 6 & 8), as well as the reasons articulated by Defendants in their Motions to Dismiss (Docs. # 3 & 7), the court intends to grant both motions to dismiss.

A separate order will be entered.

DONE this the 5th day of August, 2015.



SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Contained within the Answer was an argument that the case should be remanded. If the court were to construe the Answer as a motion to remand, it would be **DENIED**. The case is properly before the court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1367. (See Doc. #1.)